

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being added or cancelled.

Claims 22, 24, 25, 28 and 29 are currently being amended.

This amendment and reply amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 16-30 are pending in this application.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter:

Applicant appreciates the indication in the Office Action that claims 16-21 are allowed, as well as the indication that claim 24 contains allowable subject matter. By way of this amendment and reply, claim 24 has been amended to place that claim in independent form to include the features of its base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, presently pending independent claim 24 is now in allowable form based on the indications made in the Office Action with respect to that claim.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,646,555 to Forster et al.; claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forster et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0259499 to Oba et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0033757 to Rodgers et al.; claims 22-23 and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,322,415 to Cyrus et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0260455 to Dort; and claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cyrus et al. in view of Dort and further in view of U.S.

Patent No. 4,679,456 to Kaneyuki. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

Presently pending independent claim 22 recites that a stationary information device performs a radio communication to detect approach of an external device when the external device is attracted and fixed to the stationary information device. The external device includes a second radio communication unit, in which a first communication unit (part of the stationary information device) performs radio communication with the second radio communication unit of the external device when the external device is attracted and fixed to the stationary information device.

Such features as recited in presently pending independent claim 22 are not taught or suggested by Cyrus et al. and by Dort. In more detail, the Office Action asserts that column 2, lines 3-6 and 10-17 of Cyrus et al. teaches features of an external device. However, these portions of Cyrus et al. merely describe that a mechanism for sensing vehicle presence in an intersection, and whereby a toy vehicle has a magnet on its undersurface. Clearly, this description falls well short of the specific features recited in presently pending independent claim 22 concerning radio communications between a first communication unit of a stationary information device that performs radio communication with a second radio communication unit of an external device when the external device is attracted and fixed to the stationary information device.

Similarly, presently pending independent claim 28 has been amended in a similar manner, whereby such features are not taught or suggested by Forster et al. or by the combined teachings of Cyrus et al. and Dort. It is also noted that none of the other cited art of record cited against claims 29 and 30 rectifies the deficiencies of Forster et al. with respect to radio communications between a first communication unit of a stationary information device that performs radio communication with a second radio communication unit of an external device when the external device is attracted and fixed to the stationary information device. Namely, column 1, line 63 to column 2, line 27 of Forster et al. describes a wireless communication device for attachment to and detachment from articles having a magnetic surface portion so as to enable wireless communication of tracking, identification and other information between the article and another location.

Accordingly, claims 22, 23 and 25-30 are patentable over the cited art of record.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 29, 2008

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5426
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Glenn Law
Registration No. 34,371

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819